

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/723,152	SOUROUR, ESSAM A.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Betsy L. Deppe	2637	

All Participants:

(1) Betsy L. Deppe.

(2) Ed Green.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 2 December 2000

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

10, 34, and 35

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The after-final amendment did not include Figure 7A in the Brief Description of the Drawings. The amendment to claim 10 duplicated most of the steps already recited in claim 9. In claim 34, the Examiner suggested changes to lines 10 and 14 for clarification. In claim 35, "by, for" on line 10 rendered the claim vague and indefinite. Furthermore, it was unclear how (a)-(e) related to the determining step. Claim 35, line 11 also included a type ("mutlipath"). Mr. Green agreed to changes to the claims to overcome these issues..